

***New Ideas/Suggestions - Steering Committee & other Community Stakeholders***

*Tower Grove Heights Neighborhood Association's LONG TERM Solution:*

To distinguish between the TGENA's consolidated comments and the comments of other individuals, a different bullet is used, they are indented, and there are no spaces between the suggestions.

- ❖ *The Commerce Bank plans indicate that they will not be utilizing all of their current parking. We want to focus on converting the property that remains after the Commerce Bank redevelopment project into a landscaped well light parking lot. The residents with houses surrounding the bank, bought with the existing parking lot. Their home values will increase with the creation of an attractive parking area. With attractive signage, visitors will have ample parking when visiting the north end of the business district.*
- ❖ *We want to focus on using the existing areas and having the city buy Commerce's lot seems a wonderful solution to the parking crunch. Keep the character of our neighborhood. A suggestion is to have a public area with street vendors.*
- ❖ *The parking lot that is next to Cheap Trix could be improved into an attractive lot. With signage and meters it could be used by visitors. Currently it is an eyesore.*
- ❖ *Buy Phillips and again make an attractive surface lot.*

The most obvious immediate-term solution for providing significantly more parking spaces is to open up the Commerce Bank lot to the public and put up some better signage. That would take care of the issue for several years. (Steering Committee member comment)

Public hearings for no-parking zones. (TGH resident comment)

Encourage use of off-street parking by area residents. This could be by use of matching grants towards construction or repair of parking pads, garage doors, etc. (TGH resident comment)

Get a developer who is willing to give discounts if we get a certain number of residents who want to build quality garages. Sign up people who are interested. (TGH resident comment)

Strict enforcement of speed limits. (business comment)

Residential one-way streets to reduce through traffic. (business comment)

Cobblestone pedestrian crossings. (business comment)

Incentive for use of existing residential rear parking. (business comment)

Make all traffic lights red are regular but intermittent intervals to improve pedestrian friendliness. (I.E. Every fifteen minutes, all the lights would be red. The rest of the time would be "normal.") (business comment)

<i>A business buys two family home</i>	<i>\$50,000</i>
<i>Purchaser tears down home</i>	<i>\$10,000</i>
<i>Purchaser paves lot and landscapes it</i>	<i>\$10,000</i>
<i>Purchaser ends up spending at least</i>	<i>\$70,000 (for a total of maybe 13 parking spots)</i>
<i>Average cost per spot</i>	<i>\$5,400</i>

*Business should approach every household near their establishment and offer them the \$4,000 to defray the cost of developing off street parking. The catch is that it has to be wide enough for at least two cars and they must park their cars there in the space behind their home. Neighborhood gets to keep buildings. Residents get to improve their own property. Business's get twice the parking for half the cost.*

*(resident comment)*

- *Yes, I was the one who wrote in about the "neighborhood valet", but the parking study summary mentioned it and didn't fully describe it. They have a "neighborhood valet" in a neighborhood in Boston. You take 2-3 spots on each side of Grand, marked by something up high, and have valets (not in front of any particular establishment). You then run adds that say that from Wednesday evening to Sunday evening, between some times like 6-11, just come on down to S. Grand and we will do the rest. Folks who do not know the area will then walk about, not having to worry about their car.*

*(resident comment, gleaned from Tower Grove list serve)*

We just got back in from Maine and I saw the first "effective" pedestrian crosswalks that I have ever seen. They paint in the usual striped abbey road crosswalk, like in a couple of spots in the Loop (in the Loop they are in spots where there is NO stoplights). However, you have probably noticed in the Loop, that most drivers don't know that cars are supposed to stop when pedestrians are crossing, even if it is when traffic is at full speed. Most drivers just think that the pedestrians are just being risky to cross, and I thought that too until my wife pointed out the law again, there are no stoplights there, so it appears that you are crossing into full traffic with no right of way). Anyway, drivers do not know that (especially when there are crosses where there are no stoplights). And, drivers can not see the crosswalks, which are painted on the street. So, in Maine in the small towns that have busy roads running through the shopping/walking districts, they have boldly painted walks so that you know that they are different than the usual fair. Then, they have yellow flags in the CENTER of the road, which come up 4-6 feet. The flags mention that it is state law to stop at the crosswalk, etc, and have the district name. You can really read them from the driver's seat, and they are reminders about the law, the district, and that you are in a special area. But they actually look somewhat decorative along the shopping district, and make it look like a special area. They also are a lot cheaper than curb bumpouts and other options. *(resident comment, gleaned from Tower Grove listserve)*

- *The Transit Benefit Program is part of TEA-21 (Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century). It offers incentives for both employers and employees to encourage the use of public transportation and car or vanpools. The South Grand Business District is conveniently located near several bus lines and just a jaunt away from the MetroLink. It makes sense, where possible, to encourage employees in the Business District to use public transportation or carpool with co-workers or others that work nearby. RideFinders and Citizens for Modern Transit are two organizations that can help employees and employers benefit from TEA-21's Transit Benefit Program. RideFinders actually hooks people up with interested carpoolers who live and work near them.*

<http://www.cmt-stl.org/clean/program.html>

<http://www.ridefinders.org>

*(Steering Committee member comment)*

I know the First Church of Divine Science is mentioned above in a few places. I also know they've been approached at least once about their parking lot, which sits empty most of the time. I think the final parking solutions should include a strong suggestion to approach and work closely with the church towards some kind of compromise. Perhaps they could designate 8 or 10 parking spaces in their lot for employees of the District. Then they would still have spaces for daytime meetings. Or the lot could be metered. And part of the money made at meters could go towards maintaining the lot. *(Steering Committee member comment)*

*New Ideas/Suggestions - Steering Committee & other Community Stakeholders***Reply to Review Comments on Phase III Report “ Parking Solutions”**

(resident group) of December 19, 2002

**Principal 1:** *Demolition should be last resort.* The Executive Summary (Phase IV) will include an expanded section based on the Phase III Report’s “General Design Details and Planning Principles” that will address demolitions.

**Principal 2:** *Proposal of Phase One and Phase Two each with more restrictive lines of Demarcation than Phase III’s Short-Range Plan.* The Executive Summary will feature Short, Intermediate and Long-Range Parking Solutions. The consultants will look at this group’s ideas on lines of Demarcation to see if some of the ideas on parking in residential area are logical especially for the Short and Intermediate Plans. However, the parking needs on particular blocks will continue to play a major role in determining the size of solutions.

**Principal 3:** *No building on existing open lots that can be used for parking. Build garage rather than demolish housing.* The Executive Summary will emphasize in Intermediate-Range Solutions the redesign of existing open lots for parking that is functional, attractive and services nearby commercial and/or residential uses. The Long-Range Parking Solutions will deal with trying to fill in gaps in the district’s façade along South Grand with buildings. The Executive Summary will provide more direct information on general facts about implementation including identifying specific acquisition and demolition of existing building for the particular development or renovation projects.

**Principal 4:** *The group sees City Block 1463 as the focus for the entire district.* The plan establishes limits to the distance a customer or employee is willing to walk. The usefulness of the eastern most portion of City Block 1463 as a parking resource for distant buildings is likely to remain a topic upon which there is disagreement.

**Reaction 1:** *The group want removal of Item 32 – Parking Garage on Arsenal.* The Steering Committee favored looking at alternative sites including on City Block 1462 behind Streetside Records and St. Louis Bread. The consultants will investigate alternative sites for a parking garage in the northern part of the district in the Executive Summary. The Steering Committee will discuss the topic of garage sites and may vote on the various sites.

**Reaction 2:** *The group wants to maximize the use of the Commerce lot by using the entire block for parking except for the new bank and retail building. The three houses at the east end of the block would be demolished.* The plan recommends rehabbing the houses and adding 10 new residences. This reaction, which is related to principal 4 above, is a topic upon which there is disagreement.

**Reaction 3:** *Show parking ratios for City of St. Louis, Town Center and Suburban by typical use group.* The calculations were made based on the size in square feet of existing and proposed buildings and by the type of uses. The existing square footage is listed by building and by floor in the Program Document of Phase I, (South Grand Commercial Property Pages 1-3). The space was assigned based on full occupancy by likely uses, usually retail or restaurant on 1<sup>st</sup> floor, and residential or office on upper floors).

Type of City	Retail	Office	Restaurant	Residential
City of St. Louis	1.43	0.80	5.00	1.00
Town Center	2.90	2.00	8.00	1.25
Suburban	5.50	3.30	seat calc.	1.50

***New Ideas/Suggestions - Steering Committee & other Community Stakeholders*****Page 2 Reply to Review Comments Phase III Report**

Building #36 at 3212-26 South Grand (Tan My Restaurant) has 5681 square feet on the first floor (1/2 restaurant, 1/4 retail, & 1/4 office) and 5681 square feet on the second floor (residential). See next table for parking calculation results at full occupancy. The Suburban calculation is revised based on the number of restaurant seats. Building #36's figures are combined with building #34 to get the number of parking spaces for City Block 1488:  
City = 55, Town = 87, and suburban = 162.

<b>Type of City</b>	<b>Retail</b>	<b>Office</b>	<b>Restaurant</b>	<b>Residential</b>	<b>Total</b>
City of St. Louis	2	2	14	6	24
Town Center	4	3	23	8	38
Suburban	8	5	59	9	81

**Reaction 4:** *Table 42.1 does not include diagonal parking at Arsenal (54 cars) in City Block 2101.* The plan's 54 diagonal spaces are an increase of 34 spaces over the existing 20 parallel parking spaces. The table shows an increase of only 10 spaces. Therefore, all of the increase from diagonal spaces has not been shown.

**Reaction 5:** *Apparent ratios of 1.8 /1000 for City, 3.9/1000 for Town Center and 4.5/1000 for Suburban. It would seem that town center is not far below suburban standard, why not use 3.25/1000.* The plan never has calculated average ratios for each of the three types of cities. The answer to #3 above shows that town center ratios are in the middle ground between the City of St. Louis and Suburban Standards.

**Reaction 6:** *Tables 42.3-42.8 at the top do not show street parking available.* Plan showed without and with street parking because the City's Standard is based only on off-street parking and does not include street parking.

**Reaction 7:** *Item 30 should not show new buildings on blocks 1463 and 1484 if they force demolition of houses for parking.* Consultants may examine smaller infill buildings on South Grand that would not include as much demolition.

**Reaction 8:** *The group opposes demolition of 3615 Juniata.* This demolition allows an important alley connection between a string of proposed parking lots.

**Reaction 9:** *The group opposes demolition of house next to Phillips 66 building site.* No demolition other than the "66" site is included in the plan.

**Reaction 10:** *Neighborhood signed petition against demolition of 3619 and 3621 Hartford and the group oppose demolished.* Long-Range Plan reacts to large parking needs on City Block 2102.

**New Suggestions**

**Phase One:** *Hold development line to north/south alley west-side of Grand and a line about 150 feet east of Grand. Maximize parking on the Commerce Lot and if needed put a garage on Commerce lot site. See answers to Principle 2 and Principle 4.*

## ***New Ideas/Suggestions - Steering Committee & other Community Stakeholders***

### **Page 3 Reply to Review Comments Phase III Report**

#### **Phase Two:**

**Number 1:** *Phase Two put in place if phase one is implemented and is demand for parking. Expand development lines by approximately one building width. See answer to Principle 2.*

**Number 2:** *Set a requirement for bonding for parties requesting demolition. Steering Committee chooses to use City's existing procedure to approve any building demolitions. This is alternative or additional procedure could be brought up at a committee meeting.*

**Number 3:** *Consider a parking garage behind Streetside and Bread Company. The Group gives many reasons this site is a good candidate for a structured parking garage. The consultants will investigate alternative sites for a parking garage in the northern part of the district including this site in the Executive Summary.*

**Number 4:** *Consider demolition of 2 story apartment building behind 3171 Grand and the leg of building behind 3171 Grand to obtain a linear lot behind the Grand businesses. The consultants will investigate this opportunity to provide additional off-street parking.*

**Number 5:** *Consider demolition of 3698 Wyoming for same reasons as #4. The consultants will investigate this opportunity to provide additional off-street parking.*

**Number 6:** *Group prepared plan showing two development lines, phase one and two. See Principle 2.*

## ***New Ideas/Suggestions - Steering Committee & other Community Stakeholders***

### **Reply to Review Comments on Phase III Report " Parking Solutions"**

**Steering Committee – Subcommittee Group Comments (the group)  
of December 19, 2002**

*The group mentions four long-term items. Two of the group's items advance medium-term items from temporary agreements into permanent projects.*

- 1) A portion of the Commerce parking lot is acquired and developed as a permanent parking lot.*
- 2) Acquire the church and its parking lot on Wyoming, as well as acquire the garages behind the commercial buildings on the west-side of Grand, in order to develop parking lots.*
- 3) Install bump outs and other pedestrian related improvements.*
- 4) Acquire the old post office and adjacent 4-family to tie into the nearby public parking lot to the south, and explore the development of a two story parking garage.*
- 5) The consultants will look at this group's ideas to see if ideas on parking are logical for the Long-Term Plans. The group proposes a major change to the old post-office site by doubling the site's size with the acquisition of a 4-family building and doubling the site's capacity with a two-story garage. Also, it appears that the group recommends CID acquire and develop the Commerce lot, the old post office site, and the church on Wyoming for the development of enhanced, shared parking facilities.*

## ***General Comments - Steering Committee & other Community Stakeholders***

I'm thoroughly delighted with the solutions proposed by Art & Architecture. They're creative and urban. Personally, I would support almost all of them. (Steering Committee member comment)

The long-term future of urban business areas are dependent upon adequate, safe parking nearby, be it surface or multi-level garages. Experience in St. Louis has proven that business districts without access to parking have limited success while those with parking thrive. Residential property values increase as the urban businesses improve, but will not experience that increase without the parking. (business comment)

Surface parking must be appropriately landscaped, fenced or secured as needed, and be sensitive to adjacent residential property. (business comment)

The design of parking structures must fit architecturally in the neighborhood with ingress-egress planned for public safety and maximum traffic flow. (business comment)

Is there a number of existing parking spaces, a number for current need, and a projection for what will be needed in the next five – ten years based on the change in parking needs in the past? These numbers are required to make an accurate and believable case for demolition as suggested in item 30 and in preparing grant applications for funding such projects. (business comment)

- *Our thoughts on the South Grand Parking issue:*

- 1) *South Grand could use some more parking but it must be planned very carefully and it should not be any more than necessary.*
- 2) *Any parking solution must be for ALL the businesses in the district, not for a specific merchant or developer.*
- 3) *A parking area (garage or landscaped lot) should ideally be located near the center of the district. This would allow for no more than a three-block walk for any visitor. Anyone who will not tolerate this length of walk would not be a frequent visitor to South Grand in the first place.*

The parking solution should increase the accessibility of South Grand as a “destination”, but should not disrupt or discourage walking. If the sidewalk life of South Grand (its greatest charm) is disrupted or discouraged, South Grand will quickly cease being a destination and will become an area of underutilized parking lots. We really need more people on the sidewalks, not less. (resident comment)



The following resident comments were submitted by letter after the official comment period.

*South Grand Parking Study Steering Committee  
c/o Emily Andrews, SLACO  
emlandrews@hotmail.com*

*Dear Steering Committee,  
After talking with our neighbors in the 3500 and 3600 blocks adjacent to the South Grand Business District, these comments are submitted for your consideration.*

*Residents had five major comments as follows:*

- 1. Methodology for concluding that there is a parking problem:  
Residents always see empty parking spaces and question the basis for the assumption that there is a parking problem. We suggest that individual businesses look to their own practices that might discourage patronage and that the business district pursue more inviting streetscapes, better lighting, and safety issues (as mentioned in the study) instead of assuming that available parking in every block will bring customers to their door.*
- 2. If there is a parking problem, the greatly underused Commerce parking lot should be considered as the best and most obvious solution. Proposal number 33 is counter-intuitive to residents who see an existing enormous parking lot as an answer rather than creating a Traditional Town Center.*
- 3. Many people in our neighborhoods have a different vision for the future of the business district and of our neighborhoods than this study indicates. We want mostly individual, unique, and neighborhood services types of business that will also attract customers who do not live in the neighborhood. The demographics of residents around the business district can support this type of development. One or two chain type stores may be OK, if they do not destroy the streetscape on Grand and on the adjacent blocks and if the business district's success does not depend on such stores.*
- 4. The business district needs to encourage more walking. Residents are in favor of proposals that create a pedestrian friendly environment. Over the long term, such an environment will be good for the businesses.*
- 5. With regard to creating an environment that is more pedestrian friendly, residents welcome traffic calming proposals as part of the solutions.*

*With regard to the individual proposals from the consultants:*

***(NOTE THIS CORRESPONDS TO ORIGINAL SOLUTION NUMBERING SYSTEM IN PHASE 3 BOOK)***

*Residents were generally against 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32*

- Generally in favor of 13, 20, 21 if it leads to a more pedestrian friendly environment.*
- Lukewarm on 2, 34*
- Generally in favor of 6, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17. In favor of 25 except that the Amoco Building has historic architectural value and should not be torn down.*
- With regard to 10, 11, 18, 22, more public discussion is needed to make sure the process to any changes is a fair one.*
- Regarding 18, all residents of the proposed blocks should be approached before considering changing direction(s) of their street.*
- Regarding 22, Tower Grove Park should be approached before any proposals adjacent to it are proposed. There are restrictions on property around a historic landmark.*
- There was vehement opposition to 29.*

*Respectfully submitted by Neighborhood residents*